

DEBRA G. MAYES,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) ORDER
)
GRAPHIC PACKAGING)
INTERNATIONAL, INC., and)
RENEE TIPPENS,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

I. BACKGROUND

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Federal Magistrate Act provides that “a district court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir.1983). “By contrast, in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Similarly, de novo review

is not required by the statute “when a party makes general or conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations.” Id.

Moreover, the statute does not on its face require any review at all of issues that are not the subject of an objection. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); Camby, 718 F.2d at 200. Nonetheless, a district judge is responsible for the final determination and outcome of the case, and accordingly the Court has conducted a careful review of the Magistrate Judge’s M&R.

III. DISCUSSION

Mayes filed a timely objection to the M&R, but it solely consists of “general or conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. The Court thus reviews the M&R for clear error.

After a careful review of the record in this case, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations are consistent with and supported by the law. Therefore, the Court hereby adopts the M&R of the Magistrate Judge as the final decision of this Court for all purposes in this case.

IV. CONCLUSION

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that defendant Tippens’s motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 12) is **GRANTED**, and the plaintiff’s claims against Tippens are **DISMISSED**.

Signed: October 19, 2010



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge

